

Bellevue

CHARGE

TO THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF QUEBEC,

DELIVERED AT BISHOP'S COLLEGE,

JULY 1, 1868.

By JAMES WILLIAM WILLIAMS, D.D.,

BISHOP OF QUEBEC.

*Let me know wh. you think
of the Catechism -*

Montreal:

PRINTED BY JOHN LOVELL, ST. NICHOLAS STREET.
1868.

3629

CHARGE.

It is one of the uses, my reverend brethren, and not the least important one, of these periodical gatherings, that they bring home to ourselves the great lesson which, in the discharge of our office, we evermore inculcate upon others; and that we are herein brought face to face with the inexorable fact that life is short, and our tenure of life a frail and uncertain tenure. When we meet, our first thoughts are of the dead. We cannot look round this chapel without noticing the absence of those old familiar faces we used to see here. And we cannot note their absence without glancing on to that time, so soon to come, when we too shall be gone, and others will fill our places.

One of the most eminent of our brethren has been called away since last we met. Calmly, peacefully,—in a good old age,—in the fear, and the love of the God whom he had served so long,—he, whose hoar head was a crown of glory in our assemblies, “like as a shock of corn cometh in his season,”—full of years, and honoured of all,—has gone down to his grave—“in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life.” As we stood, eleven of us, his brethren in the ministry, at the grave of the Rev. S. S. Wood, a peculiar and pensive sadness touched our hearts. It was no ordinary funeral. He was the last of his race. Belonging to a bygone generation,—of which he and his dear friend, whom I have been called in the order of God’s providence to succeed, offered to our contemplation types so admirable and so attractive—he lived on into these more bustling, and, as I sometimes think, shallower times. And, irresistibly, as there we stood, was borne in upon us—upon me at least—the heart-searching thought: Do you—the men of this generation—walk in the steps—can you be said to fill the places—of those godly and well-learned men? I will not linger

upon this thought, my brethren, but I am constrained to utter it. The time and the place have suggested it. I am persuaded that the thought is a wholesome one; and I trust that the searching of heart to which it must give rise will be fruitful—in all of us—fruitful—of humility, of zeal, of prayer, of study.

We live in times when, if ever, these quantities are needed—especially the first. Lack of zeal can hardly be called a characteristic of the times;—(and yet who will say that there is no lack of zeal? which of us, when he bares his conscience before God, but deploras the coldness, and the faintness, and the littleness of the zeal that is in his own heart?) Still it cannot be denied that the times, as compared with other times, are times of no inconsiderable zeal. And many there now are who give themselves to prayer; and some are deeply learned; but somehow all this does not—to make a broad statement—does not issue in humility. The most thoroughgoing optimist could hardly say that it is characteristic of the men of this our day to esteem others better than themselves. Least of all is this temper to be observed where it most should flourish, in the Church of Christ.

The great danger that we are in by reason of our unhappy division, comes, as it seems to me, out of the obstinate assumption, by individuals, and schools, of their own infallibility; and out of their determination to hear in the authoritative voice of the Church only the echoes of their own private opinions. The dangers, it may be thought, do not affect us: our peace has not been disturbed: our house is at unity with itself. Our house, God be thanked, is at unity with itself. But it would be unwise to suppose that the waves of the storm which now agitates the Mother Church will not reach our shores. The channels of opinion are open. The communications of sympathy are swift and subtle, and minds removed are in contact still. It is to be assumed, therefore, that we are, or shall be, asking ourselves the questions which now stir men's minds in the great centres of theological thought.

And in entering upon any investigation of this kind, our first question must be—what, on this particular subject, is the teaching of our own branch of the Church. If she speaks explicitly, that settles the point for us, so long as we remain in the Church, to speak and to teach in her name. It is very necessary that we

should be clear in our minds upon this point; because there is a fallacy rife which not only misleads and confuses those under its influence, but eats unperceived into that intellectual integrity in the defect of which truth is neither discerned nor desired. Men will say, and do say, that this is to take low ground—that the scriptures are above the Church, or that the Catholic Church is above our particular Church; that the first question is not whether such and such a doctrine be taught by the Church of England, but whether it be taught by the Word of God; or held by the Church Catholic. Such an argument may be pertinent and valid in the mouth of a dissenter. It is not honest in the mouth of a clergyman of the Church, unless the question be whether he shall continue a clergyman of the Church or not. The first question for him is, “What is the teaching of that branch of the Church whose minister I am?” If that teaching is plain and explicit, then his first duty is to read it with a fair and open mind. And if he is convinced that this teaching is contrary to the Word of God, his duty is under no circumstances to contradict the teaching of the Church of which he is a minister; but, if the point be a vital one, upon which his conscience bids him speak, then his only honest course is, first of all, to cease to be a minister of that Church. I speak, you observe, of the obligations morally binding the clergyman. The layman is in a different position. If he is wise, he will be diffident where he differs from those formularies which sum up the faith and the interpretation of ages; but he is neither excommunicate nor bound to secede because he cannot perceive the correctness of the Church’s rule in every particular. I ought, perhaps, to apologize to you, my reverend brethren, for seeming to instruct you in the elementary principles of common honesty. I don’t suppose you stand in need of this. But I do find it so often assumed—when a clergyman falls back on the plain teaching of the Church; or proceeds to inquire what the mind of the Church is upon any disputed point—that he is taking a low, unworthy, unspiritual, uncatholic ground—that I am constrained to ask what else can an honest man do? His first question, so long as he is the Church’s minister, must be, what does the Church herself say?

And this course I propose to follow out now, by inquiring what is the teaching of the Church concerning the Sacraments; an

inquiry suitable, as I believe, to the times—suitable because of the Church's language touching one Sacrament novel interpretations have been propounded; and because the other Sacrament is still, in places, so huddled into a corner that the Church's own authentic voice is but seldom heard in the congregation.

What is the teaching of that branch of the Church to which we belong, in her own authentic documents? Let that be the first question. If the Church speaks intelligibly, explicitly, the question, of course, may then arise, Is that teaching consistent with the teaching of the Catholic Church? or of the Scriptures? Into these questions I do not propose now to enter. We shall have done much to-day, if we can, by interrogating the Church herself, ascertain what it is we have pledged ourselves to teach.

And it will be convenient, before treating of the Sacraments severally, to make some general observations upon (1) Sacramental grace, and (2) the position which the Sacraments hold in the Church system.

Our Church differs from most bodies of modern Protestants (setting aside the Lutherans) in that, whilst they reject the doctrine of Sacramental grace, she maintains it; whilst they regard the Sacraments as symbolical ceremonies merely, she teaches that they are instruments of grace. "Not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession," but "sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace. (*efficacia signa*.)"

With this difference respecting the nature of the Sacraments, it is not surprising that there should be a difference in their use and estimation. Whilst the Protestant bodies around us are infrequent in their celebration of the one Sacrament, and private commonly in their administration, or even wholly negligent of, the other, our Church requires the public administration of both, permitting their private administration upon the ground of sickness only. She holds them to be generally necessary to salvation. She brings both prominently forward in her worship; requiring all baptisms to be administered in the face of the congregation—in the midst of the morning or evening prayers; and providing for the celebration of Holy Communion every Sunday; and where suitable and convenient, as in "Cathedrals, Collegiate Churches, and Colleges, where there be many Priests and Deacons," by directing that there shall

be a celebration every Sunday at the least. The Sacraments, in fact, in her system, are not adjuncts, or appendages, they are joints and sinews. Her whole system is based upon the principle that "Our Lord Jesus Christ gathered His people into a society by Sacraments." And it were well that the Sacraments occupied the place the Church gives them. I do not want you to be always preaching about the virtues of the Sacraments. But I do wish that from one end of the diocese to the other they were allowed to preach for themselves.

For the want of this not a few among our congregations are astonished when, by chance, a preacher uses the Church's own language. The Church plainly says that, in holy Baptism, the child is regenerate—made a child of God and a member of Christ. And yet, if a preacher say the same, he will be told by not a few, that he is delivering a "soul-destroying doctrine." Now, if the Sacrament of Baptism were always administered in the congregation, this could not be. I am aware that those who thus object, mean one thing by regeneration, whilst the Church means another; but this does not remove the inconsistency of solemnly declaring that the child is regenerate, and then pronouncing this a "soul-destroying doctrine." And if the Sacrament were administered in the congregation the inconsistency would be forced upon people's attention. They would be compelled either to forbear the use of the words, or to seek in them a meaning that was neither a "lie" nor a "delusion of the devil." The Church uses the word regeneration in its ancient, scriptural, acceptation. The objectors to the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration assign to it another meaning, and then pronounce her doctrine a "lie," not because her own statement, but because the statement they have constructed for her, and foisted upon her, will not square with facts. The word regeneration occurs only twice in the New Testament. In one place it refers to the life in Heaven—the final state of the saved—and this passage may be dismissed as obviously irrelevant to the present argument. In the other passage it is used, as the Church uses it, of the grace of Baptism—which is termed the "laver," or "the washing of regeneration." In the minds of the objectors regeneration is equivalent to the renovation and conversion of the soul. But the Church is not unscriptural because they are confused.

This, however, by the by. My present object is not so much to refute objections as to call attention to the Church's own authoritative declaration.

She says, they that receive Baptism rightly "are thereby, as by an instrument, grafted into the Church, the promises of the forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed." Now, when an instrument is signed and sealed, the rights and benefits therein contained are given and conveyed to the covenanting party. What are these in the covenant of Baptism? They are here named—

(1) Forgiveness of sins.

(2) Adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost.

Original sin, then, is forgiven to all who rightly receive the Sacrament, and actual sin to those who have committed it. And who are those who "rightly" receive?

Those who come to receive it in faith.

If it be objected that infants cannot come with faith, I answer, that may be an argument of some weight if the question be of the propriety and validity of infant Baptism, but it in no wise diminishes our belief in the grace of Baptism "rightly" received.

The second point is, our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost.

We are placed by Baptism in a state of salvation—adopted into God's family—surrounded by all the holy helps and influences—made heirs to all the blessings and privileges of that family—grafted into Christ's body, and made members of Him. If we live to discern between good and evil, to be capable of right and wrong—there must be the realization of these gifts and privileges in our personal experience. With the waking of the will there must be a renewal of the mind in the likeness of Christ. For the soul that has sinned there must be a conversion to God. This is the Church's doctrine concerning Baptismal regeneration. And how a man who believes less than this can "allow" the articles, and use the Baptismal service, I am at a loss to conceive.

In regard to the Holy Eucharist, amongst those who reject the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, there have been since the Reformation, as you know, and still are, three main divisions of opinion. Luther maintained that the Lord's body is present

along with the elements; Zuingle, that the Sacrament is a purely symbolical and commemorative right; while Calvin held that Christ is truly, but spiritually, present in the Sacrament. And this is the doctrine of the Church of England. Outside of the Church, amongst the Reformed, (except of course, the Lutherans) the Zuinglian doctrine has, in modern times, overgrown and killed the Calvinistic view.

Our Church teaches that the "Body and Blood of Christ" are "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper;" but "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner."

What is the meaning of this? When a man is said to do a thing in a "spiritual manner," does this mean that he does it in his spirit as moved, or influenced by the Holy Spirit? We are told not. We are told that this is to affix a "modern meaning" to the term spiritual." I do not quite understand the objection. If, when we are interpreting the article, we give the word the sense it bore in the minds of those who framed the article, I do not see how this can with any relevancy be called affixing to it a "modern" meaning. And that the sense in which the word "spiritual" is now commonly used, is not different from that in which it was used by those who framed the articles, will appear from the following quotations:—

"For there be, indeed, three manners of eating, one spiritual only, another spiritual and Sacramental, and the third Sacramental only; and yet Christ himself is eaten but in the first two manner of ways, as you truly teach. And for to set out this distinction somewhat more plainly, that plain men may understand it, it may thus be termed, that there is a spiritual eating only when Christ by a true faith is eaten without the Sacrament. Also there is another eating both spiritual and Sacramental, when the visible Sacrament is eaten with the mouth, and Christ himself is eaten with a true faith; the third eating is Sacramental only, when the Sacrament is eaten and not Christ himself."—*Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner on the Lord's Supper, page 206. Edition of Parker Society.*

"But all this I understand of his spiritual presence, of the which he saith, I will be with you until the world's end; and where two or three be gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. . . . And wheresoever in Scripture it is said that Christ, God, or the Holy Ghost, is in any man, the same is understood spiritually by grace.—*Preface to the same.*

And similarly in his disputations at Oxford, Ridley* speaks of "spiritual partaking of the Body of Christ to be communicated and given, not to the bread and wine, but to them which do worthily receive the Sacrament." The terms "spiritually" and "by grace" he uses as convertible terms, and "grace" he defines to be "the society or conjunction with Christ through the Holy Ghost."

And one of Cranmer's† opponents, in his disputation at Oxford, puts the argument, from the Romish point of view, in this way :

"He gave us the same flesh which he took of the Virgin."

But he took not his true flesh of the Virgin spiritually, or in a figure.

Ergo.

He gave his true natural flesh, not spiritually.

But if it is meant that the Reformers did not use the word aright,—that they gave it a "modern meaning," that concedes the point, for the question, is not what they ought to have meant, but what they did mean in the Article which they propounded, and we subscribed. In truth, however, it will not be so easy to shew that the ordinary use of the word is misuse, a use different from that of the word in the New Testament. It is, indeed, quite possible that the word, in its widest and vaguest acceptance, signifies "supernatural;" but mostly its use is more restricted—mostly it signifies not only an action, or operation, which is from the Spirit of God, but in the spirit of man. When the Apostle writing to the Galatians, says, "ye which are spiritual;"‡ and when in his Epistle to the Ephesians, he mentions their "spiritual songs,"§ and when he tells how he prays that the Colossians may have a "spiritual understanding,"|| in all these passages the word has its "modern" meaning *no—as Ellicott, Abbott, affirm in locc.*

This question, however, touching the force of the word spiritual, is but a piece of a movement in religious thought, which is large in itself, and, as it would seem, pregnant with larger consequences.

There has been, during the last few years, a great slide in opinion on all matters touching the Holy Eucharist. Men have moved

* Disputations at Oxford. Ridley's Works. Parker Society, page 240.

† Works of Cranmer. Disputations at Oxford, 403.

‡ Galatians, vi. 1.

§ Ephes. v. 19.

|| Col. i. 9.

from the old belief—the belief of Hooker and of Taylor, and of Waterland, not scatteringly, as individuals, but, as it seems, in masses. The altered stanza in the Christian Year, forms a compact illustration of this shift in belief.

“O come to our Communion Feast,
 “There present in the heart;
 “Not in the hands th’ Eternal Priest,
 “Will his true self impart.”

wrote the revered poet in his younger days.

“O come to our Communion Feast,
 “There present in the heart;
 “As in the hands th’ Eternal Priest,
 “Will his true self impart.”

is the posthumous form which, of course, represents his later belief. The first form of this stanza exhibits the old Church of England doctrine, as thus expounded by Hooker :

“The real presence of Christ’s most blessed Body and Blood, is therefore not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.”

And again :

“I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when, and where the bread is His body, and the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them.”*

“The real *objective* Presence” is the favourite phrase by which they express their belief who hold that our Lord’s body is present in the hand as well as in the heart. In a sense, no doubt, all who do not regard religion to be a mere moral gymnastic, would say that all Christian graces are objective—they come to us from without—but regard being had to the very different thing meant by the phrase “real objective Presence,” and the aptness of the word “objective” to express the meaning of those who so use it, we cannot do better than join issue upon that word, and examine whether the Church of England teaches that Christ is objectively,

* For the language of English Divines on this subject, see note A Appendix.
 † Book v. sect. 67.

in that sense of the word, present in the Sacrament, or whether she holds, with Hooker, that His presence is subjective—in the heart of the recipient only.

We are told that "the Real Presence takes place before the act of reception." "Christ is there, and he is received "by the faithful, good and bad, alike."

But the 29th Article says: "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith are in no wise partakers of Christ."

We will examine the attempt to reconcile these two statements presently; and consider now, the grounds upon which the writer, from whose clever book* I have quoted, bases his statement that Christ "is received by the" faithful, "good and bad alike." All turns here upon the word "faithful," as used in the Catechism, which the writer contends is the Church's final and conclusive interpretation of her formularies. It must explain them. They must not be brought to explain it. This is his dictum. But he is the first to violate his own rule. The Catechism says, the "Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received *by the faithful*" in the Lord's Supper;" and forthwith he fetches a meaning from the 19th Article to put it upon "faithful" in the Catechism; and contends that because the article defines the visible Church to be a congregation of faithful men; and since the visible Church is made up of good and bad alike; therefore "faithful" in the Catechism, must mean good and bad alike. Now, waiving the inconsistency of this procedure, and granting the reasonableness (and I think the reasonableness is very great) of explaining the Catechism by the Articles, when the meaning of the Catechism is in dispute, I ask which is the more reasonable course, when we would fix the meaning of the word "faithful" in the explanation of the Lord's Supper in the Catechism, to go to an article on a wholly different subject, or to the articles on the very same subject matter. Well, then; we turn to the 28th Article "of the Lord's Supper," and we find this: "*The mean whereby* the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper *is faith.*" And in the 29th Article: "Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of

* *King of Peace.*

the Lord's Supper," we find "The wicked and such *as be void of a lively faith*, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustin saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, *yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ.*"

If, the meaning of the Catechism is to be fetched out of the articles, we must conclude that when the Catechism says that the Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the "faithful," faithful here signifies those who have that faith which is "the mean whereby they receive the same"—that "lively faith" of which such "as be void, are in nowise partakers of Christ." It should seem then, that no further illustration of the word "faithful" as used in the Catechism, is needed. But if illustration is needed, we have it. The Catechism of Dean Nowell is thus expanded in illustration of the word "faithful:"

"An ergo soli fideles corpore et sanguine Christi pascuntur?

Soli omnino—cum quibus enim corpus suum cum iisdem et vitam eternam communicat.

Quamobrem corpus et sanguinem Christi in pane et calice includi, aut panem et vinum in substantiam corporis et sanguinis ejus mutari, non fatetur?

Quia illud esset veritatem corporis Christi in dubium vocare."

Now, Nowell's Catechism, which received the approval of the Lower House of Convocation, has always been held to be of no small weight and authority in exposition of Church doctrine. At any rate, be the authority of the book what it may upon the question of doctrine, it is evidence incontrovertible as the *usus loquendi* of our theologians in the time of Elizabeth. Evidence of this use we may have also, for the reign of Edward VI., from a sermon preached in Eton College Chapel, during that reign:—

"Now carnal and disobedient men do not eat Christ's body; forasmuch as it is eaten only in spirit and in faith, that is of spiritual and faithful men and women."

Finally, if in the Prayer Book what is predicated of the "faithful" is predicated of all Christians, good and bad alike, then all, good

and bad alike "after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh" are with God "in joy and felicity."^{*}

With the failure of the attempt to prove that the word "faithful" in the Catechism means all Christians, good and bad alike, the doctrine of the "objective" presence as a doctrine taught by the Church, falls to the ground. There stands in the Catechism an authoritative declaration incompatible with it. But even if it were shown (which it is not) that the word in the Catechism has its wider, vaguer use, and is put for Christians generally—supposing it would be a fair treatment of the Church's words to say "which are verily and indeed taken and received by Christians in the Lord's Supper," though this would certainly be compatible with the doctrine of the "objective" presence, it would be very far from proving it. Many qualities, actions, and states are said to be proper to Christians which certainly are not found in all who bear the name of Christian, good and bad alike.

In support, however, of the doctrine as assumed to be established by this interpretation of the word faithful, a distinction is made between "taking" and "receiving."

"They (the Body and Blood of Christ) are in the hand of the communicant as "taken" before he receives them."[†]

It so happens that we have the words "taken" and "received" in this same connexion in the 28th Article (of which more "emphatical" statement this phrase in the Catechism is said to be "simply a reiteration")[‡] where the Body of Christ is said to be "taken" after an heavenly manner, and the means whereby it is "received" is said to be faith. It so happens too, that we have the Articles in a Latin form; and, when we turn to the Latin, this mist of ambiguity, so ingeniously cast round the words "taken and received, clears off at once, for the word, in each case, is one and the same.

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, (*accipitur*) and eaten, in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received (*accipitur*) is faith."

And now, how can that be in a man's hand as "taken," before he takes it, or "received" before he receives it? One would have thought that the article was plain enough. The Body of Christ is

^{*} Burial Service. [†] Kiss of Peace, p. 50. [‡] Kiss of Peace, p. 51.

only *taken*—*received*—where there is faith, where it is not *taken*—*received*—it is not given. The force of the first clause lies in the word *only*. It is not said that the Body is given to all; but that where it is given, it is given in no other than in a heavenly and spiritual manner. Well, but in the case of the *worthy* recipient, who not only receives the elements, but receives Christ, the priest cannot give the body, unless it be in the elements before it is received! Why not? He gives absolution though he does not hold it in his hand. And, just as here, the absolution is received where there is the internal condition upon which reception is dependant; and not otherwise. Neither is it given.

It would be, perhaps, needless to push this matter any further, were it not that when the loose and popular meaning of the word faithful—"believers"—has been assigned instead of the precise accurate meaning it bears in the Catechism—then—in order to reconcile the Catechism as explained with the 29th Article, another part of the Catechism is misused. "Faithful" has been made to mean, or to include, "the wicked;" but still the article says the wicked "are in nowise partakers of Christ." How is this to be got over? In this way.

It is said that the Church divides the Sacrament into three parts.* "I (the Church) treat the Sacraments under three distinct parts."

1. The outward sign—*signum Sacramenti*.
2. The thing signified—*res Sacramenti*.
3. The benefits or effects of receiving the same—*virtus Sacramenti*.

Then a phrase is found in the Catechism which I cannot find there—"partakers of the benefits of" (Christ). Then it is affirmed that this new phrase, "partakes of the benefits of" (Christ) is equivalent to "partakers of Christ" in the article. And so it is concluded that the article denies only that the wicked are partakers of the *virtus Sacramenti*; leaving it to be held that they are in a sort partakers of Christ—that they do in fact partake of the *res Sacramenti*—THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST. I answer that, however this conclusion may be arrived at, it is incompatible with the asser-

* Kiss of Peace p. 33 and 34.

"many of the benefits of the sacrament are theirs."

tion of the article that the "wicked and such as be void of a lively faith are in *nowise* partakers] of Christ"—*nullo modo*.—But the manipulation of the Catechism by which this result was attained will not bear a moment's examination. In the Catechism it is asked, "How many parts are there in a Sacrament?"

And answered; "Two, the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace."

And this is turned into, "I (the Church) treat the Sacrament under *three* parts!" True, the benefits of the Sacrament are made here to stand for the third part. But it is scarcely fair to make the Church say there are *three parts* of a Sacrament, when she distinctly and logically says there are only *two*; as logically as distinctly, for the effects of a thing are no part of the thing. Health is the effect of food, but it is no part of food.)

And if the benefits and effects *must* be brought in, and made to stand for *parts* of the Sacrament, we have in the Catechism four parts, not three. Beside the (1) *res*, and the (2) *signum*, there is (3) the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ; and (4) the strengthening and refreshing of our bodies by the bread and wine.

But even this is not enough. Not only must the benefits—the effects—of the right receiving of the Sacrament be made a part of the Sacrament, but the words of the Catechism must be distorted.

Here are the words:—

Quæ.—"What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?"

Ans.—"The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine."

And this is turned into "partakers of the benefits of" (Christ); given as the words of the Catechism, which are then said to be equivalent to "partakers of Christ" in the article!! This is too bad. "Whereof" can only mean "of which benefits." What are the benefits of which benefits we are partakers thereby? And is it fair dealing to represent this as a statement that we are "partakers of the benefits of" (Christ)?—a phrase which sounds sufficiently like another, and a very different one, to be mistaken for it.

Closely connected with the doctrine of the Objective Presence is that of the Eucharistic Sacrifice—a doctrine which is made, to hang mainly upon the words of institution, "This is my body which is given for you." And "Do this in remembrance of me."

We will take the latter first. Τοῦτο ποιῆτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Which is rendered, "offer this as a memorial sacrifice." The Church besides the sacrifice of alms giving in the offertory, makes no mention of any sacrifice offered in the Sacrament save (1) "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, (2) the offering of ourselves "to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice."

Besides this, the *unconsecrated* elements, in their dedication for holy use, are called "oblations."

"So far, then, as the language of our office is concerned, it teaches us that the Holy Communion is a commemoration of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and a sacrifice of ourselves to God.

"In her Catechism again, it is declared that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained *not* that we might sacrifice the Body and Blood of Christ, but, for a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby; but of any act of sacrifice on our part no mention is made at all.

"The Articles content themselves with affirming that the sacrifice of masses, in which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, but give no intimation that there is any other sense in which the Holy Communion may be expounded as a sacrifice of Christ."*

In the Homily on the worthy receiving of the Sacrament, the Church does give an intimation of her mind in the matter.

"We must, then, take heed *lest of a memory it be made a sacrifice.*"

But the argument is derived, as I said, not so much from the language of the Church, as from the words of institution, and the staple of it is drawn out of the use of the word *μυστήριον*. This, we are told, is a sacrificial term, and must be interpreted to mean "offer in sacrifice." And passages in the Septuagint are referred to, where it is so used.

* Charge of the Bishop of Llandaff, 1866.

Now the facts are these. *ποιεῖν* is a word of common use, of which the fundamental meaning is "do." What this doing is depends upon the context; *ποιεῖν καρπὸν* is to bear fruit,—*ποιεῖν ὁδόν* is to travel—*ποιεῖν ἄμνον* is to sacrifice a lamb; but in every instance that I have been able to find where it is to be rendered "sacrifice" or "offer" (as a sacrifice) the idea of sacrifice has been imported into it from the context. This is the usage of the Septuagint. In the New Testament, the word which occurs (if I have made no mistake in counting) five hundred and sixty-six times, stands in two passages, Matt. xxv. 18. and Heb. xi. 26, in connexion with the passover, and might, therefore, mean sacrifice; though our version in each case renders it "keep the passover." And in Luke ii. 27, "to do for him after the custom of the law," is the translation, or *τὸν ποιεῖν*, &c. &c.; and as this custom was to make an offering, *ποιεῖν* means to offer. But in no other case out of the five hundred and sixty-six can it mean "sacrifice." And further,—sixty-five times, as I reckon, and sixty-five times only, (excluding the passage of St. Luke just referred to, and the words of institution) the word occurs in places like that in which we are endeavouring to ascertain its force, viz.: with *οὗτος*, or *αὐτός* for its object; and in all these, it means simply "do." And, further still, there are thirty-nine* passages, and only thirty-nine, that I can find, where a verb is used to signify sacrifice, or offer (sacrificially); and where, in accordance with Septuagint usage, *ποιεῖν* might be used; but it never is. Unless then we know, from other sources, that the words of institution refer to a sacrifice, we are not bound, we have no reason, to find it in the word *ποιεῖν*.

But, it is replied, we do know that: we find it in the word *ἀνάμνησις*, which is also a sacrificial word, and means always something offered to Almighty God, to remind Him of the worshipper himself, or of some other person or object in whom the worshipper takes an interest. The word is so used in Numb. x. 10, ch. v. 15, where it is said of the offerings—"that they may be to you for a memorial before God."

"But the word in itself," (I again quote from the Bishop of Llandaff, whose also are the references to Waterland and Made, which I shall presently use,) simply means a record, or memorial, and is

* See Note B, Appendix.

just as applicable to anything else as to a sacrifice that was to bring sins to remembrance. Neither is there anything in the passage that conclusively proves it to have been so applied by our Lord in the last Supper. Had it been said, *eis tēn hēmēn anámuñsin évanri toū theou ípōn*, as it is said in Num. x. 10, or *évanri Kuplou*, as it is in verse 9, we should be bound to accept this special interpretation, but in the absence of any such limitation, we are at full liberty to believe that the words may mean "in remembrance of all that I have done while coming in and going out among you, and specially of that death and passion which I am about to undergo."

But this interpretation, it would be urged, is precluded by the words, "This is my body which is given for you." "Is given," it might be contended, is also a sacrificial word, equivalent to "is offered in sacrifice;" and the form of the word, it might further be contended, requires us to refer it to something done there and then. The words therefore "This is my body," directly, and unmistakably, assert, it would be said, the real objective presence, and that then, at the feast, the sacrifice of Himself was begun by our Lord.

To this, I answer, (1) that scholars are by no means agreed that the present participle necessarily implies that the action took place there and then; more especially as the Hebrew language has no future participle;* (2) that the sacrifice of Christ's body was not made until He was crucified; the assertion that He then sacrificed Himself "in will," and so began the sacrifice, being pure assumption; (3) that our Lord, as he lived upon earth, could not hold his own body in His hand. What, then, becomes of the Lord's assertion, "This is my body? Just what becomes of his other assertions: "The seed is the word"—"The field is the world"—"The reapers are the end of the world"—"I am the door"—"I am the true vine"—"My father is the husbandman."† But we have the best possible illustration of this form of speech in the writings of St. Paul. If we turn to 1 Cor. x, we find it stated in the heading of the chapter, in our version, that "the Sacraments of the Jews are types of ours;" and in the chapter itself we read—"Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under a cloud, and all passed through

* Bp. of Llandaff's charge.

† See Taylor on Real Presence, vol. ix. p. 482.

the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the sea. And did all eat of the same spiritual meat; and did all drink of the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them—and that Rock was Christ." I do not press the word "spiritual" here. It is quite possible that it means miraculous—furnished by the Spirit of God. I rely upon the last sentence to illustrate the form into which the words of institution are cast.

But this question raises another, which needs, strangely enough, to be discussed over again in these days. First, however, let me say that I would not be misunderstood in what I have said. I hold that, in the words of Waterland,* if "the *elements* themselves, unconsecrated, were ever called a *sacrifice*, or *sacrifices*, the meaning still was that the *service* was the sacrifice; but when the *consecrated* elements bore that name it was only a metonymy of the *sign* for the *thing signified*, as we *represent*, and in effect exhibit, the grand sacrifice of the Cross." But I would not speak lightly of the *spiritual* sacrifice. Believing, with St. Augustin, that "*verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sanctâ societate inhaeramus Deo*," I hold that the service of the Eucharist "is both a *true* and *proper* sacrifice, and the noblest that we are capable of offering." The sacrifices of prayer and praise—the sacrifice of ourselves, and of our substance—the offering up of the mystical body of Christ,—that is His Church—the sacrifice of Faith—and self-humiliation.† "These, I think, are all so many *true* sacrifices, and may all meet together in the one great complicated *sacrifice* of the Eucharist," which is thus a *commemorative sacrifice*. "If that phrase means a *spiritual service* of ours, commemorating the *sacrifice* of the Cross, then it is justly styled a *sacrifice* commemorative of a *sacrifice*, and in that sense a *commemorative sacrifice*; but if that phrase points only to the outward *elements* representing the sacrifice made by Christ, then it means a *sacrifice* commemorative; or a *representation and commemoration of a sacrifice*."‡

"This kind of language, to speak of the Eucharist as a *sacrifice*, *yea*, and a *true* sacrifice, but understanding it to be of the *spiritual* kind, was the uniform language of Antiquity, and of the whole Reformation."§

* Vol. iv, pp. 715-764.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. vi, 134.

§ Ibid. vi, 134.

I believe, with Mede,* that "Christ is offered in this sacred Supper *commemoratively* only—that is, by this sacred rite of bread and wine we represent and inculcate His blessed Passion to His Father; we put Him in mind thereof by setting the monuments thereof before Him; we testify our own mindfulness thereof unto His sacred Majesty." This is what I have been taught, and what I believe of the spiritual sacrifice. To pass now to that other development of Eucharistic doctrine of which I spoke.

In the 28th Article it is said that "Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine, in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given rise to many superstitions." In so saying, according to advanced modern views, the Reformers meant not to deny Transubstantiation, but trans-accidentation. After quoting the Rubric at the end of the Communion office, and the 28th Article, the clever writer, whose arguments I have been examining, says: "Now, what I want to prove is, that in the one case the words 'very natural substances' mean 'very natural properties,' i. e. 'accidents; and in the other, that 'Transubstantiation' really 'means 'Trans-accidentation.'"

The conception of substance in the minds of the Reformers possibly differed from the conception which modern thinkers have of the same; but to suppose that they made no distinction between "substance" and "accident" is not a little absurd. Their whole language bristles with these technicalities of the schools. To take an instance from Cranmer's answer to Gardiner:

"And where you grant that 'accidents to be without substance is against the common course of natural things, but it is done by a spiritual miracle,' this is but a cloud to darken the light. For accidents to be without substances is not only against the common course of natural things, but also against the very nature of accidents which have none other being but in substances (as they be defined, *accidentis esse est inesse*) and is also against all philosophy, reason, and workings of God ever since the world began. For God never created nor made, with miracle nor without miracle, substances without accidents nor accidents without substances, as some vainly phantasy, *de materiâ primâ*."

* Christian Sacrifice.

† Cranmer's answer to Gardiner's Book on the Sacrament, Book II. Page 326 of the Parker Society's edition.

And again, to take another instance from Bishop Cooper, "whoever was the author of the "Defence of the Truth against the apology of Private Mass."

"You never read in all the course of the Scripture, that God's power turned the substance of anything and left the qualities of the other thing that it was, saving only in the case you imagine it."

The writers, it is easy to observe, display not only a familiarity with the distinction between "substance" and "accident," or quality, but a philosophical grasp of their true relation very much in advance of that evinced by the author of "The Kiss of Peace." The only substance which modern thought recognizes besides mind, is the external cause of our sensations. We are compelled by the constitution of our mind to assume that there is something without us which is the cause of our sensations, which are of the accidents. But we are compelled by the constitution of our minds to assume *this only because we have the sensations*. They come to us from without. We cannot think of them as having no cause; and that unknown something which causes them, we call their substance; and the sensations themselves, viewed objectively as coming from without, we call the attributes or accidents of that substance. When the accidents change, we are compelled by the same condition of thought which compels us to believe that our sensations have an external cause to believe that that cause, i. e. their substances is changed, and not before. The grain of wheat that lies in my hand (to use the illustration of the writer, from whom I have quoted so often, though he is looser than ever here in his hold upon the conception of substance, and confounds it with bulk or quantity) presents to my mind certain sensations of form, colour, density, &c. These I call its attributes qualities, accidents; and I cannot help believing that there is a cause outside my own mind, which brings those sensations to it. So long as the attributes (which are the sensations objectively considered) remain, I cannot help believing that the cause of their continuing to exist continues to exist also. When the attributes disappear, and other attributes take their places, the cause which made and continued the first set of attributes has changed. When the yellow compact grain has become a disintegrated white powder, the cause which made it

* Defence of the Truth. Parker Society, p. 195.

yellow and compact has passed away. The cause which made it yellow and compact does now make it white and a powder. In other words, the substance,—which again I repeat is only the name for the unknown, assumed, objective cause of our sensations,—has changed. The sensations themselves are the only things we know. A cause for these we must assume—that it remains whilst the attributes exist, we must believe. But that is all—of this cause, this substance, this substratum itself, we know, and can know, nothing. To assert, then, that there is a change of substance whilst the attributes remain unchanged, besides being in flat contradiction to the article, is, an unintelligible contradiction in itself. It is very easy to make large predication concerning the unknown and the unknowable, but it is very idle.

Another point I had marked for examination, but upon consideration,—and finding that the argument issues in the triumphant conclusion that the Marian Martyrs were the real maintainers of the Roman doctrine, whilst their persecutors were, in some unaccountable manner, ignorant of the same—I have thought that this view may very well be left to refute itself. In passing, however, I am constrained to remark, that it is lamentable to observe how securely those who misrepresent the Reformers, can count upon the general ignorance. If people would but read for themselves the remains of the Reformers, such misrepresentation of their speech and belief, as is now unhesitatingly promulgated, would be simply impossible.

I trust, my reverend brethren, that I have not been too minute in this criticism. I have thought it right to expose the fallacies of this little book, because it is widely circulated, cleverly written, and, as I believe, dangerous to the faith and loyalty of Churchmen. If it comes into your hands, let me ask you, before you surrender your judgment, to weigh well what I have said on the other side.

Having dwelt so long upon this topic of the Sacraments, I shall endeavour to be brief in what remains to be said. Something, however, I wish to say, concerning (1) Marriages and (2) Burials. And first of Marriages. Our Church knows no other place for the celebration of the Marriage Service than the House of God. This wholesome rule, in the early days of the Province, when the

churches were few, it was, perhaps, impossible rigidly to observe. For a long time, however, and over by far the greater part of the diocese, there has been no other reason for the practice of marrying in private houses than the inveterateness of the custom, which had grown out of the necessities of a sparsely settled country. Marriage is, indeed, a civil contract. And it so happens that the State, for its own convenience, empowers the ministers of religion to register that contract. And for the purpose of the civil contract, the State regards it as a matter indifferent, whether the contract be made in a private house or in a church. With all this we have nothing to do. But, besides this, marriage has another aspect for us. It is a religious rite—a contract made before God—and it little becomes us, as God's ministers, to lend ourselves to assist in the perpetuation of any custom of which the tendency is to sink this part of the ceremony, and to derogate from the sacredness—the religious character—of the marriage relation. Nor can it be a right or a seemly thing for the ministers of the Church, moved by no necessity, but only in gratification of a popular whim, to fly in the face of the Church's rule.

There are still some parts of the diocese, no doubt, without Churches within a reasonable distance, to which the parties may resort to be married. And, in these cases, the Church's blessing should not be withheld. The necessity, however, of each particular case, can alone excuse the violation of the Church's rule. And this necessity should be strictly scanned. I have, myself, given a hasty consent to the celebration of a marriage in a private house, where, as I afterwards found, no such necessity existed. I regret this. I shall exercise a stricter caution in any case that may hereafter come before me. I trust, my reverend brethren, that you will do the same. And, these clearly exceptional cases being excepted, I must enjoin upon you to refuse to marry all who refuse to come to the Church to be married.

There is, too, in some parts of the diocese, a strong desire upon the part of the people to have the burial service read in the house from which the corpse is taken. At first sight, it would appear that this was exactly similar to the desire for private marriages. There is a difference, however, and one in which we shall, I hope, find the solution of the difficulty. As I understand the matter, it is

not that the mourners object so much to go to the Church, as that they object to the removal of their dead without prayer and the reading of God's word. Now, that is a feeling which commands respect. Very tenderly would I deal with the exquisite sensitiveness of affections, all quick and raw from recent affliction. And I believe that, if the clergyman, (who, we may assume, has been in the habit of reading to, praying with, exhorting, warning, comforting, both the sick man and his friends; and who will do the same for these latter again before the days of their mourning are ended,) were kindly and firmly to reason with the mourners, pointing out the impropriety of deviating from the Church's rule, and at the same time offering to visit them at the time of the funeral—I believe that they would be very willing to carry their dead to the Church. And I do not see why the clergyman should not do this, and do it gladly. He will find hearts opened and softened as they never were before, and as, perhaps, they will never be again. I commend this matter to your serious consideration; and, whilst I am bound to urge upon you the due and orderly observance of the Church's rule. I have, as I think, pointed out how this may very well consist with a readiness to meet the by no means unnatural nor unreasonable wishes of your parishioners.

And now, my reverend brethren, I must bring these observations to an end. As on former occasions, I have endeavoured to be strictly practical. These two latter topics, upon which I have been addressing you, are pressingly practical. Continually these questions present themselves for solution; their demand for a solution is peremptory; and action is the only solution of which they admit. What you are asked to do, you must do, or refuse to do. And though it might be said that my statement respecting the grace of the Sacraments is doctrinal and critical, yet, if we understand by practical, whatever conduces to the efficient discharge of our duties, there can be few things in the address of a Bishop to his Clergy, more practical than an attempt to make plain what in the mind of the Church her Sacraments are; and what is the true manner of their use; especially in these days, when the Church's own pointed and emphatic language is either thrust out of sight or explained away.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A. PAGE 11.

The best divines of the Church of England, whilst they maintain the Real Presence of our blessed Lord in the Sacrament, and declare that the Church leaves the manner of His Presence undefined, evince, in the main, their own belief that the Presence is a subjective one, as will appear by the following extracts. It will also be seen that the very thing against which they all strenuously protested is that which it is now attempted to bring in, namely, that a particular mode of the Presence, (*e. g.*, in the Host, for the purposes of adoration and oblation,) is necessary to be believed as a part of the Catholic Faith:—

HOOKE, E. P., Book v. lxvii.

"The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament (*i. e.*, in the elements); but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.

What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not. It is enough that *unto me that take them* they are the Body and Blood of Christ."

DONNE, lxxx. Sermons, fol. 1640, p. 84, E.

"When thou comest to this seal of thy peace, the Sacrament, pray that God will give thee that light that may direct and establish thee in necessary and fundamental things; that is, the light of faith to see that *the Body and Blood of Christ is applied to thee in that action*; but for the manner, how the Body and Blood of Christ is there, wait His leisure, if He have not yet manifested that to thee: grieve not at that, wonder not at that, press not for that; for He hath not manifested that, not the way, not the manner of His Presence in the Sacrament, to the Church."

Bp. ANDREWS, against Bellarmine, quoted by Bp. Forbes, in his *CONSIDERATIONES MODESTÆ*, Vol. ii. *Of the Eucharist*, § 14. Ed. Lib. A. O. T.

"It cannot have escaped the notice of the Cardinal, save willingly and of set purpose, that Christ said, 'This is my Body,' not 'After such a manner this is my Body.' We agree with you as regards the subject; all the controversy is

about the manner. As regards the words 'This is,' we hold, with a firm faith, that it is. As to the 'It is after such a manner,' viz., by the bread being transubstantiated into the Body; as to the manner whereby it comes to pass that it is: by or in, or with, or under, or by transition, there is not a single word there; and because there is not a single word, we rightly banish it from the faith. Among the enquiries of the schools it may perhaps be, but we place it not among the articles of faith. What Durandus is reported to have said of old, by no means displeases us: 'The word we hear, the effect we feel, the manner we know not, the presence we believe.' A presence, I say, we believe, and that not less true than you do. As to the manner of the presence, we define nothing rashly; nay, more; we do not anxiously enquire no more than how, in our baptism, the blood of Christ washes us; no more than how, in the Incarnation of Christ, the Human Nature is united to the Divine in the same Person. We reckon it among the mysteries; and truly the Eucharist itself is a mystery, of which that which remains ought to be burnt with fire, as the Fathers very elegantly express it; that is, adored with faith, not discussed with reason."

ABP. LAUD, Works, Vol. iii., p. 354 *Ed. Lib. of Anglo-Catholic Theology.*

Defending the Introduction into the Scottish Liturgy of the words, 'that they may be unto us the (*ut fiant nobis*) the Body and the Blood of Christ,' he says: "For if it be only *ut fiant nobis*, that they may be to us the Body and the Blood of Christ, it implies clearly that they 'are to us,' but are not transubstantiated in themselves into the Body and Blood of Christ, nor that there is any corporal presence in or under the elements. When they are said to become the Body or Blood of Christ *nobis*, to us that communicate as we ought, there is by this addition (*fiant nobis*) an alloy in the proper signification of the body and blood, and the true sense so well signified and expressed, that the words cannot well be understood otherwise than to imply *not the corporal substance, but the real and yet the spiritual use of them.*"

Again, p. 358:

"If Bellarmine mean no more by the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ than a commemoration and representation of that great sacrifice offered up by Christ, he doth well in it. But if he go further than this, and by 'the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ' mean that the priest offers up that which Christ himself did, and not a commemoration of it only, he is erroneous in that, and never can make it good."

Again, in the 4th Fol. Ed. of his Ans. to Fisher, p. 187:

"Besides, if this were or could be made a concluding argument, I pray, why do not you believe with us in the point of the Eucharist? For all sides agree in the faith of the Church of England, that in the most blessed Sacrament, the worthy receiver is, by his faith, made spiritually partaker of the true and real Body and Blood of Christ, truly and really, and of all the benefits of his Passion. Your Roman Catholics add a manner of this His presence Transubstantiation, which many deny; and the Lutherans, a manner of this Presence, Consubstan-

tiation, which more deny. If the argument be good, then even for this consent, it is safer communicating with the Church of England than with the Roman or Lutheran; besides, all agree in this truth, not in any other opinion."

Again, pp. 192, 8:

"And the Church of England is Protestant too. So Protestants, of all sorts, maintain a true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist."

"Now, that the learned Protestants in Queen Mary's days did not deny, nay, did maintain the Real Presence, will manifestly appear. For when the Commissioners obtended to Jo. Frith the Presence of Christ's Natural Body in the Sacrament, and that without all figure or similitude; Jo. Frith acknowledges that the inward man doth as verily receive Christ's Body as the outward man receives the Sacrament with his mouth. Nay, Archbishop Cranmer comes more plainly and more home to it than Frith. For if you understood (saith he) by this word Really, Reipet; that is, in very deed and effectually, so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of His passion, is indeed and truly present. And so, likewise, Bishop Ridley. Nay, Bishop Ridley adds yet further, and speaks so fully to this point, as I think no man can add to his expression; and 'tis well if some Protestants except not against it. 'Both you and I (saith he) agree in this, that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, &c.; only we differ in modo, in the way and manner of being. We confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being. I confess Christ's Natural Body to be in the Sacrament by spirit and grace, because that whoever receives worthily that Bread and Wine, receives effectually Christ's Body and Blood, that is, he is made effectually partaker of His Passion."

BRAMHALL, Works (Ed. Lib. of A. C. Theology), Vol. i., p. 22.
Answer to M. de La Milletière.

"We rest in the words, *This is My Body*, leaving the manner to Him who made the Sacrament. We know it is sacramental, and therefore efficacious, because God was never wanting to His own ordinances, where man did not set a bar against himself; but whether it be corporally or spiritually (I mean not only after the manner of a Spirit, but in a spiritual sense); whether it be in the soul only, or in the host also; and if in the host, whether by consubstantiation or transubstantiation, &c., we determine not."

HAMMOND, *Practical Catechism*, Lib. vi., Sect. iv.

"This is My Body (signifies) this breaking, taking, eating of the Bread; this whole action is the real communication of the Body of Christ to me; that as really as I eat the bread in my mouth, so verily God in heaven bestows on me, communicates to me the Body of the crucified Saviour. God's part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, bestowing that Body and Blood of Christ upon us, not by sending it down really for our bodies to feed upon, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it; as when the sun is communicated to us, the whole body and bulk of the sun is not removed out of

its sphere, but the rays and beams of it, and with them the light and warmth and influences are really and verily bestowed or darted out upon us."

BP. JEREMY TAYLOR, Works, Vol. ix., p. 428, 9, *Of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament*, Section i., § 8.

"We say that Christ's body is in the Sacrament 'really, but spiritually.' They (the Romanists) say it is there 'really, but spiritually.' Where, now, is the difference? Here; by 'spiritually' they mean 'present after the manner of a spirit;' by 'spiritually' we mean 'present to our spirits only.' They say that Christ's Body is truly present there, as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body; but after that manner of being as an angel is in a place; that is, there spiritually. But we, by the real spiritual presence of Christ, do understand Christ to be present, as the Spirit of God is present, in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace; and that is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence."

BP. BULL'S *Corruptions of the Church of Rome*, Works, Vol. ii., p. 252.

"In the Eucharist Christ is offered, not hypostatically but commemoratively only. In the Holy Eucharist we set before God the Bread and Wine as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ, shed for us, and of His precious Body, and plead to God the merit of His Son's sacrifice, once offered on the cross for us sinners, and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching Him, for the sake thereof, to bestow His heavenly blessings upon us."

Again, a little lower down:—

"We are not ignorant that the ancient Fathers generally teach that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the consecration of them, do become and are made the Body and Blood of Christ. But we know, also, that though they do not all explain themselves in the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very different from the doctrines of transubstantiation. Some of the most ancient Fathers of the Church seem to have had this notion; that by or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the Spirit of Christ or a divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that, therefore, they are said to be and are the Body and Blood of Christ; the same Divinity, which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in Heaven being virtually united to the elements of Bread and Wine on earth, which seems to be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies."

JOHN JOHNSON'S views of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is well known, namely, that the Holy Ghost descended upon the elements, and by communicating His power and presence to them, made them to be the Body and Blood of Christ, "*not in substance, but in power and effect*," (Works, vol. i., p. 151). Hence, he

declares (p. 318), that the ancient Church did not believe that the true substance of Christ's Body and Blood was given by the celebrator, or by any other means, either with or without the bread."

BP. COSIN, *History of Transubstantiation, Works* (Ed. Lib. A. C. T.), Vol. iv., p. 174.

"Because the thing signified is offered and given to us as truly as the sign itself, in this respect we own the union betwixt the Body and Blood of Christ and the elements, whose use and office we hold to be changed from what it was before. But we deny what the Papists affirm . . . and we also deny that the elements still retain the nature of Sacraments, when not used according to divine institution, that is, given by Christ's ministers and received by his people; so that Christ, in the consecrated Bread, ought not, *cannot be* kept and preserved to be carried about, *because he is present only to the communicants.*"

His meaning he makes more clear in his *Notes to the Book of Common Prayer, Works, Vol. v., p. 345.*

"True it is that the Body and Blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present when the blessed Bread and Wine are taken by the faithful communicants; and as true it is also that they are not present, but only when the hallowed elements are so taken, as in another work (the *History of the Papal Transubstantiation*), I have more at large declared. Therefore, who soever so receiveth them, at that time when he receiveth them, rightly doth he adore and reverence his Saviour there together with the sacramental Bread and Cup, exhibiting his own Body and Blood unto them. Yet, because that Body and Blood is neither sensibly present (nor otherwise at all present but only to them that are duly prepared to receive them, and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally in that act united), the adoration is then and there to be given to Christ himself, neither is nor ought to be directed to any external sensible object, such as are the blessed elements."

Again, in a Paper upon the Differences and Agreements of the Churches of Rome and England, Bp. Cosin, after laying down that we differ upon Transubstantiation, says:

"We agree in acknowledging His Sacramental, spiritual, true and real presence there to the souls of all them that come faithfully and devoutly to receive Him, according to His own institution, in that Holy Sacrament."

FORBES, *Considerationes Modestae*, Vol. ii., § 7, p. 380, Ed. Lib. of A. C. Theology.

"The opinion of those Protestants and others seems most safe and most right, who think, nay, who most firmly believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ is

truly, really and substantially present and taken in the Eucharist, but in a way which is incomprehensible to the human understanding, and much more beyond the power of man to express; which is known to God alone, and not revealed to us in Scripture; a way, not indeed corporeal or by oral reception, but not by the mere understanding and simple faith either; but by another way, known (as has been said) to God alone, and to be left to His omnipotence."

And in the next section he quotes, with approval, the words of Philip Melancthon:

"Not to depart far from the ancients, I have placed the sacramental presence in the use, and have said that when these things are given, Christ is truly present and efficacious. This, assuredly, is enough. Nor have I added any such inclusion or conjunction by which the Body should be affixed to the Bread, or should be soldered to it, or mingled with it. . . . But I, although, as I have said, I hold a real presence, do not hold an inclusion, or a soldering together, but a sacramental presence, that is, that where the signs are, there is Christ, in a truly efficacious manner. What more would you ask?"

DR. THOS. JACKSON, Works, Vol. x., p. 52.

"May we say, then, that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, as well to the unworthy as to the faithful receivers? Yes, this we must grant. Really present He is, because virtually present to both, because the operation, or efficacy of His Body and Blood, is not metaphorical, but real in both. Thus the bodily sun, though locally distant for its substance, is really present by its light and heat. . . . Now, when we say that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, our meaning is, that as God He is present in an extraordinary manner, after such a manner as He was present before His Incarnation in His sanctuary; and by the power of His Godhead thus extraordinarily present, He diffuseth the power or operation of His human nature either to the vivification or hardening of their hearts who receive the Sacramental pledges."

BP. WILSON, Works (*Sacra Privata*), Ed. Lib. A. C. T., Vol. v., p. 339.

"Do this: i.e., This that I do—offer Bread and Wine as a sacrifice to God (when consecrated). They could not offer His real Body, but only His sacramental Body, as a memorial of His real Body."

It is evident, from the context of this passage, that Bp. Wilson adopts John Johnson's view, as given above, and which excludes the real objective presence.

BP. BEVERIDGE, on the XXXIX Articles, Art xxviii., Works, Vol. vii., p. 482. Treating of the last clause of the article, he says:

"If the bread be not really changed into the Body of Christ, then the Body of Christ is not really there present."

Again, p. 492:

"A wicked man doth not only miss of the grace signified by the Bread and

Wine; but in eating and drinking the Bread and Wine that signify that grace, they do but eat and drink damnation to themselves." "Not as if the Sacraments themselves were the cause of their damnation, but because their coming with sinful hearts to it becomes an aggravation of their sins."

ABP. WAKE on the Catechism, Sect. 48.

"Are the Body and Blood of Christ really distributed to every Communicant in this Sacrament?"

"No, they are not; for then every communicant, whether prepared or not for it, would alike receive Christ's Body and Blood there. That which is given by the Priest to the Communicant is, as to its nature, the same after consecration as it was before, viz., Bread and Wine; only altered as to its use and signification.

"If the Body and Blood of Christ be not really given, and distributed by the Priest, how can they be verily, and indeed, taken and received by the faithful Communicant?"

"That which is given by the Priest is, as to its substance, Bread and Wine; as to its sacramental nature and signification, it is the figure or representation of Christ's Body and Blood, which was broken and shed for us. *The very Body and Blood of Christ, as yet, it is not. But being with faith and piety received by the Communicant, it becomes to him, by the blessing of God and the grace of the Holy Spirit, the very Body and Blood of Christ.* As to those who come unworthily to it, it is made damnation; that is, it renders them worthy of it, and without repentance it will certainly consign them over unto it."

NICHOLSON'S Exposition of the Catechism, Ed. Lib. A. C. T., p. 167.

"Great disputes there are how Christ is in the Sacrament. Some conceive that, for the presence there, it is necessary that Christ be incorporated with the sacramental elements: Others, that the Bread and Wine are changed into His very Body. Others, who deny the substantial change, yet acknowledge His presence, express their meaning in different terms, thus: corporeally and substantially, say some; sacramentally, say others; typically and figuratively, say a third; spiritually, say a fourth; really, say the last.

"Mr. Hooker's judgment to me, in this difference of opinion, seems very pious; that since that all are agreed that Christ is there, and seals His promises to a worthy receiver, and the question is only *de modo*, of the manner how He is there, that disputes and debates, enemies to piety and abatements to devotion, be suffered to take their rest, &c. "What these elements are in themselves, it skills not; it is enough that to me, who take them, they are the Body and Blood of Christ. His promise in witness thereof sufficeth. His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any agitation possess the mind of a faithful Communicant, but this? O, my God, Thou art true? O, my soul, thou art happy?"

THE BISHOP OF EXETER states the doctrine of the Church of England, with his accustomed precision, thus:

"The other sophism rests on the ambiguous meaning of the word Sacrament,

a word sometimes, and more strictly, applied to the sign or matter, sometimes to the whole sacred rite. Now, it is in the former sense that the Church of Rome holds the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament. It is in the latter that the real presence in the Sacrament, maintained by the Church of England, must be sought. The Church of Rome holds that the Body and Blood of Christ are present under the accidents of Bread and Wine; the Church of England holds that their real presence is in the soul of the Communicant at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

Letter to Charles Butler, Esq., by the Rev. Henry Phillpotts, D.D.; page 235. (Murray, 1825.)

Again :

"It is in this sense that the crucified Jesus is present in the Sacrament of his Supper; not in, nor with, the Bread and Wine, nor under their accidents, but in the souls of the communicants, not carnally, but effectually and faithfully, and therefore most really."—Ibid, p. 236.

BP. BROWNE, On the Articles, p. 709, thus sums up the teaching of our best Divines on this mysterious subject:—

"From the time of the Reformation to the present, all the great luminaries of our Church have maintained the doctrine, which appears on the face of our formularies; agreeing to deny a corporeal, and acknowledging a spiritual feeding in the Supper of the Lord. It is scarcely necessary to recount the names of Mede, Andrews, Hooker, Taylor, Hammond, Cosin, Bramhall, Usher, Pearson, Patrick, Bull, Beveridge, Wake, Waterland. All these have left us writings on the subject, and all have coincided, with but very slight diversity, in the substance of their belief. They have agreed, as Hooker says, that "Christ is *personally* present, albeit a part of Christ be *corporeally* absent;" that "the fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ," but that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament (i.e., in the elements), but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."

NOTE B. PAGE 13.

Mark XIV., 12.....	When they killed (margin sa- crificed) the Passover.	οτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον.
Luke XXII. 7.....	When the Passover must be killed.	ἐν ᾗ εἶδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.
Acts. XIV. 13.....	Would have done sacrifice.	ἤθελε θύειν.
18.....	That they had not done sacri- fice.	τὸν μὴ θύειν.
1 Cor. V. 7.....	Christ our Passover is sacri- ficed for us.	τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτίθη Χριστός.
1 Cor. X. 20.....	The things which the Gentiles ᾶ sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils.	θύει τὰ ἔθνη δαιμονιοῖς θύει—(οὐ θύουσι).
Rev. II. 14 and 20.....	Things sacrificed into idols.	εἰδωλοθύτα.
Mat. V. 23.....	If thou bring thy gift to the altar.	ἐὰν προσφέρῃς τὸ δῶρον.
24.....	Offer thy gift.	προστένγκε τὸ δῶρον.
VIII. 4.....	Offer the gift that Moses com- manded.	προστένγκε τὸ δῶρον.
Mark I. 44.....	Offer for thy cleansing.	προστένγκε περὶ τοῦ καθ- αρ. μόν.
Luke V. 14.....	Offer for thy cleansing.	προστένγκε περὶ τοῦ καθ- αρισμῶν.
Acts. VII. 42.....	Have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices.	μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσ- ηνέγματέ μοι.
Acts. XXI. 26.....	Until that an offering should ἔως be offered for every one of them.	οὐ προσηνέχθῃ ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου αὐτῶν ἡ προσφορά.
Heb. V. 1.....	That he may offer both gifts ἵνα and sacrifices.	προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας.
8.....	To offer for sins.	προσφέρειν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν.
XIII. 8.....	For every High Priest is or- dained to offer gifts or sa- crifices.	εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας.
4.....	Somewhat to offer.	ὅ προσενέγκῃ.
4.....	Seeing that there are Priests that offer gifts according to the law.	ὄντων (τῶν ἱερέων,) τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ νόμον.
IX. 7.....	Which he offered for himself.	ὅ προσφέρῃ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ.
9.....	In which were offered both gifts and sacrifices.	δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας προσφέ- ρονται.
14.....	Offered himself without spot to God.	ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἁμωμον τῷ θεῷ.
26.....	Should offer himself often.	πολλάκις προσφέρῃ.
28.....	So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.	ἀπαξ προσενέχθεις.
X. 1.....	Those sacrifices which they ᾶς offered year by year.	προσφέρουσιν.
2.....	Ceased to be offered.	ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι.
8.....	Which are offered by the law.	κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται.
11.....	Every High Priest standeth daily offering oftentimes the same sacrifices.	πύλλας προσφέρων.

- 13..... But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, ἐμίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσέφερεν ἑνὴν θυσίαν.
for ever sat down on the right hand of God.
- xi. 4..... By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain. προσήνεγκε τῷ θεῷ.
God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain.
- 17..... By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac. πίστει προσενήνοχεν Ἀβραάμ.
Offered up his only begotten son. τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν.
- vii. 27..... Who needeth not dally as those High Priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once when He offered up Himself. ἐαυτὸν ἀνετέλεσεν, &c.
those High Priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once when He offered up Himself.
- xiii. 15..... Let us offer the sacrifice of praise. ἀναφερῶμεν θυσίαν ἀνέσσεως.
praise.
- James ii. 21..... When he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar. ἀνέτελες Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.
- 1 Pet. ii. 5..... Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. ἀνέτελεται πνευματικὰς θυσίας.
- Rev. viii. 3..... And there was given unto him much incense that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints. ἐδόθη αὐτῷ θυμιάματα πολλὰ ἵνα δώσῃ ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.